



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,758	06/20/2001	Paul Peterson	30020/37196	3993

4743 7590 04/06/2005

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
6300 SEARS TOWER
233 S. WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

MILIA, MARK R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,758

Applicant(s)

PETERSON, PAUL

Examiner

Mark R. Milia

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/7/02
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 5, line 16, "102" should be "202". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 15-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6148148 to Wain et al.

Regarding claim 15, Wain discloses an apparatus for producing a novelty item at a point of purchase (see Fig. 2), the apparatus comprising a user input module structured to receive a user input identifying one of a plurality of predetermined themes (see Fig. 5 and column 7 lines 7-13 and 20-22), a memory device operatively coupled to the user input module, the memory device storing a foreground image and a

background image associated with the identified theme (see Fig. 8, framestore "31" and column 8 lines 6-23), a digital image capture module structured to capture a digital image at the point of purchase (see column 6 lines 47-67 and column 7 lines 30-32), an integration module operatively coupled to the digital image capture module and the memory module, the integration module being structured to combine at least a portion of the background image, at least a portion of the captured digital image, and at least a portion of the foreground image to create a final composite image (see column 7 lines 41-52 and column 8 lines 6-32), and a printer driver operatively coupled to the integration module, the printer driver being structured to cause a printer to print the final composite image at the point of purchase to produce a printed image (see column 7 line 56-column 8 line 5).

Regarding claim 16, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 15, and further discloses a display driver structured to generate display signal indicative of a graphical representation of each of the plurality of predetermined themes (see column 7 lines 7-22).

Regarding claim 17, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 16, and further discloses wherein the user input module is structured to receive a graphical user interface input identifying one of the plurality of predetermined themes (see column 6 lines 31-35 and column 7 lines 7-22).

Regarding claim 18, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 15, and further discloses a display driver structured to generate display signal indicative of a graphical representation of the captured digital image (see column 7 lines 29-40).

Regarding claim 19, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 18, and further discloses wherein the user input module is structured to receive alignment inputs causing a change in relative proximity of the captured digital image and the background image in the final composite image (see column 7 lines 46-52 and column 8 lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 20, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 15, and further discloses a display driver structured to generate display signal indicative of a graphical representation of the final composite image (see column 7 lines 40-57 and column 8 lines 6-32).

Regarding claim 22, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 15, and further discloses an interlacer structured to generate a composite background image and a composite foreground image (see column 8 lines 6-32).

Regarding claim 23, Wain discloses the apparatus discussed in claim 22, and further discloses wherein the interlacer is further structured to generate a composite interior image using the captured digital image and a predefined interior image stored in the memory device (see column 6 lines 6-10, reference shows a supplementary picture or image can be interlaced with a captured image which is analogous to an interior image, therefore the claim is anticipated by the reference).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 -10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain in view of U.S. Patent No. 6329987 to Gottfried et al.

Regarding claim 1, Wain discloses a method of producing a novelty item at a point of purchase, the method comprising the steps of receiving a user input at a computing device located at the point of purchase, the user input being indicative of a customer selection, the user input identifying one of a plurality of predetermined themes, the identified theme including a foreground image and a background image (see Fig. 2, column 6 lines 31-35 and 40-46, column 7 lines 20-22, and column 8 lines 6-23), capturing a digital image of a person at the point of purchase (see column 7 lines 30-45), digitally combining at least a portion of the background image, at least a portion of the captured digital image, and at least a portion of the foreground image to create a final composite image (see column 7 lines 40-51 and column 8 lines 6-23 and 30-37), and printing the final composite image at the point of purchase to produce a printed image (see column 7 line 56-column 8 line 5).

Wain does not disclose expressly affixing a lenticular surface to the printed image to produce the lenticular novelty item.

Gottfried discloses affixing a lenticular surface to the printed image to produce the lenticular novelty item (see column 10 lines 3-5 and column 12 lines 45-61).

Regarding claim 2, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 1, and Wain further discloses the step of displaying a graphical representation of each of the plurality of predetermined themes on a display device operatively connected to the computing device at the point of purchase (see column 7 lines 7-22).

Regarding claim 3, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 2, and Wain further discloses wherein the step of receiving a user input identifying one of a plurality of predetermined themes comprises the step of receiving a graphical user interface selection associated with one of the graphical representations of the plurality of predetermined themes (see column 6 lines 31-35 and column 7 lines 7-22).

Regarding claim 4, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 1, and Wain further discloses the step of displaying a graphical representation of the captured digital image on a display device operatively connected to the computing device at the point of purchase (see column 7 lines 29-40).

Regarding claim 5, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 4, and Wain further discloses the step of receiving alignment inputs at the computing device, the alignment inputs causing a change in relative proximity of the captured digital image and the background image in the final composite image (see column 7 lines 46-52 and column 8 lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 8, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 1, and Wain further discloses the step of positioning the person in a predetermined location relative to a digital camera (see Fig. 2 and column 6 lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 9, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 8, and Wain further discloses the step of positioning the person in front of a solid colored background (see column 6 lines 14-20).

Regarding claim 10, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 1, and Wain further discloses the steps of operatively coupling a digital camera to the computing device before the step of capturing a digital image of a person (see column 6 lines 58-60), and transferring the captured digital image to the computing device automatically in response to the step of capturing the digital image (see column 6 lines 61-67 and column 7 lines 30-32).

Wain & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to change when the angle of viewing is changed as disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1-5 and 8-10.

Regarding claim 6, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 1, and Wain further discloses the step of displaying a graphical representation of the final composite image on a display device operatively connected to the computing device at the point of purchase (see column 7 lines 40-57 and column 8 lines 6-32).

Regarding claim 7, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 6, and Gottfried further discloses wherein the step of displaying a graphical representation of the final composite image comprises the step of displaying a plurality of two dimensional frames sequenced to produce a three dimensional illusion (see column 6 lines 51-67).

Wain & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to be three dimensional as disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6-7.

Regarding claim 13, Wain and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 1, and Gottfried further discloses the step of printing a lenticular registration mark on the printed image, the lenticular registration mark facilitating rotational positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image and axial positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image (see column 14 lines 49-67).

Wain & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to change when the angle of viewing is changed disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain in view of Gottfried and U.S. Patent No. 5117283 to Kroos et al.

Regarding claim 26, Wain discloses a method of producing a novelty item at a point of purchase, the method comprising the steps of capturing a digital image of a person at the point of purchase after the steps of generating the composite background

image and the composite foreground image (see column 7 lines 29-40), deleting a portion of the composite background image to create a specialized background image, the portion of the composite background image deleted being dependant on the captured digital image (see column 7 lines 46-52), deleting a portion of the captured digital image to create a intermediate digital image, the portion of the captured digital image deleted being dependant on the composite foreground image (see column 8 lines 10-16), digitally combining the specialized background image, the intermediate digital image, and the composite foreground image to create a multiple composite image (see column 7 lines 40-51 and column 8 lines 6-23 and 30-37), and printing the multiple composite image at the point of purchase to produce a printed image (see column 7 line 56-column 8 line 5).

Wain does not disclose expressly generating a composite background image, generating a composite foreground image, and affixing a lenticular surface to the printed image to produce the lenticular novelty item.

Kroos discloses generating a composite background image (see column 6 lines 13-25) and generating a composite foreground image (see column 6 lines 4-13).

Gottfried discloses affixing a lenticular surface to the printed image to produce the lenticular novelty item (see column 10 lines 3-5 and column 12 lines 45-61).

Regarding claim 27, Wain, Kroos, and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 26, and Wain further discloses the step of displaying a graphical representation of each of the plurality of predetermined themes on a display device operatively connected to the computing device at the point of purchase (see column 7 lines 7-22).

Regarding claim 28, Wain, Kroos, and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 26, and Wain further discloses the step of receiving alignment inputs, the alignment inputs causing a change in relative proximity of the captured digital image and a predetermined interior image (see column 7 lines 46-52 and column 8 lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 29, Wain, Kroos, and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 28, and Wain further discloses the step of interlacing the captured digital image and the predetermined interior image (see column 8 lines 6-32).

Regarding claim 31, Wain, Kroos, and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 26, and Gottfried further discloses the step of printing a lenticular registration mark on the printed image, the lenticular registration mark facilitating rotational positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image and axial positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image (see column 14 lines 49-67).

Wain, Kroos & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the composite background and foreground image aspect of Kroos and the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to change when the angle of viewing is changed as disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kroos and Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claims 26-29 and 31.

Regarding claim 30, Wain, Kroos, and Gottfried disclose the system discussed in claim 26, and Gottfried further discloses the step of displaying a plurality of two dimensional frames sequenced to produce a three dimensional illusion representing the lenticular novelty item (see column 6 lines 51-67).

Wain, Kroos, & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the composite background and foreground image aspect of Kroos and the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to be three dimensional as disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kroos and Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain and Gottfried as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kroos.

Regarding claim 11, Wain discloses deleting a portion of the composite background image to create a specialized background image, the portion of the

composite background image deleted being dependant on the captured digital image (see column 7 lines 46-52), deleting a portion of the captured digital image to create a specialized interior image, the portion of the captured digital image deleted being dependant on the composite foreground image (see column 8 lines 10-16), and digitally combining the background image, the captured image, and the foreground image to create the final composite image (see column 8 lines 6-32).

Wain and Gottfried do not disclose expressly retrieving a composite background image, retrieving a composite foreground image, and digitally combining the **specialized** background image, the **specialized** interior image, and the **composite** foreground image to create the final composite image.

Kroos discloses retrieving a composite background image (see Fig. 2 (84) and column 6 lines 33-51), retrieving a composite foreground image (see Fig. 2 (82) and column 6 lines 33-51), and digitally combining the **specialized** background image, the **specialized** interior image, and the **composite** foreground image to create the final composite image (see column 6 lines 4-25).

Regarding claim 12, Wain further discloses wherein the identified theme includes an interior image and the step of digitally combining comprises the step of interleaving the portion of the captured digital image with the interior image (see column 8 lines 6-10).

Kroos also discloses the step of interleaving the portion of the captured digital image with the interior image (see column 6 lines 4-13).

Wain, Gottfried, & Kroos are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the composite background and foreground images and digital combination aspect of Kroos with the system of Wain and Gottfried.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kroos and Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11-12.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain and Gottfried as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6258194 to Danon.

Wain and Gottfried do not disclose expressly wherein the step of affixing a lenticular surface to the printed image comprises the step of affixing a lenticular surface including an ***adhesive material exposed by peeling back a cover layer***.

Danon discloses wherein the step of affixing a lenticular surface to the printed image comprises the step of affixing a lenticular surface including an ***adhesive material exposed by peeling back a cover layer*** (see Figs. 2-4 and column 3 lines 41-58).

Wain, Gottfried, & Danon are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the process for making lenticular stickers of Danon with the system of Wain and Gottfried.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching and personalized image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 5-25 of Danon).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Danon with Wain and Gottfried to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Kroos.

Wain discloses deleting a portion of the composite background image to create a specialized background image, the portion of the composite background image deleted being dependant on the captured digital image (see column 7 lines 46-52), deleting a portion of the captured digital image to create a specialized interior image, the portion of the captured digital image deleted being dependant on the composite foreground image (see column 8 lines 10-16), and digitally combining the background image, the captured image, and the foreground image to create the final composite image (see column 8 lines 6-32).

Wain does not disclose expressly retrieving a composite background image, retrieving a composite foreground image, and digitally combining the **specialized**

background image, the **specialized** interior image, and the **composite** foreground image to create the final composite image.

Kroos discloses retrieving a composite background image (see Fig. 2 (84) and column 6 lines 33-51), retrieving a composite foreground image (see Fig. 2 (82) and column 6 lines 33-51), and digitally combining the **specialized** background image, the **specialized** interior image, and the **composite** foreground image to create the final composite image (see column 6 lines 4-25).

Wain & Kroos are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, a photobooth and system for interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the composite background and foreground images and digital combination aspect of Kroos with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kroos with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Gottfried.

Wain does not disclose expressly wherein the display driver is structured to generate display signal indicative of a plurality of two dimensional frames sequenced to produce a three dimensional illusion.

Gottfried discloses wherein the display driver is structured to generate display signal indicative of a plurality of two dimensional frames sequenced to produce a three dimensional illusion (see column 6 lines 51-67).

Wain & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to be three dimensional as disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wain as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Gottfried.

Wain does not disclose expressly wherein the printer driver is structured to print a lenticular registration mark on the printed image, the lenticular registration mark

facilitating rotational positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image and axial positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image.

Gottfried discloses wherein the printer driver is structured to print a lenticular registration mark on the printed image, the lenticular registration mark facilitating rotational positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image and axial positioning of the lenticular surface on the printed image (see column 14 lines 49-67).

Wain & Gottfried are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, interlacing images to obtain a desired effect or for personal enjoyment.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the lenticular method and process to make printed images appear to change when the angle of viewing is changed disclosed by Gottfried with the system of Wain.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more eye-catching image and more options for a user to create the desired composite image (see column 1 lines 25-36 and column 3 lines 21-39 of Gottfried).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gottfried with Wain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. To further show state of the art refer to U.S. Patent numbers

Art Unit: 2622

6619860 (Simon), 6542646 (Bar-Yona), 6400374 (Lanier), 6091482 (Carter et al.), 6301385 (Chen et al.), and 6026215 and 6549295 (Fantone et al.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached at (571) 272-7402. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark R. Milia
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

MRM

JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622



EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622